

## **MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)**

### **CITY OF TUCSON HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN**

#### **Technical Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, January 16, 2008, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.**

**U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Tucson Field Office**

**201 North Bonita Ave, Suite 141**

**Tucson, AZ 85745**

#### **ATTENDEES**

##### **City of Tucson (COT) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members present:**

Dennis Abbate (Arizona Game and Fish Department)

Marit Alanen (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service) – *Arrived late due to out of town meeting*

Rich Glinski (Arizona Game and Fish Department – *retired*)

Trevor Hare (Sky Island Alliance / Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection)

Guy McPherson (University of Arizona School of Natural Resources)

##### **Other Attendees present:**

Ann Audrey (City of Tucson – Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development)

Amanda Best (Westland Resources)

Jamie Brown (City of Tucson – Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development)

Courtney Conway (University of Arizona)

Mike Cross (Westland Resources)

David Jacobs (Arizona Attorney General's Office / Arizona State Land Department)

Kathleen Kennedy (Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection)

Ries Lindley (City of Tucson – Tucson Water Department)

Bob Schmalzel (Westland Resources)

#### **1. Approval of TAC Meeting Minutes**

The TAC approved the November 7, 2007 City of Tucson (COT) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting minutes with the edits from Dennis and clarification from Ralph. Mike asked why minutes are not currently being posted to the web site. Jamie responded that the Office of Conservation and Sustainable Development (OCSD) had staffing changes that caused a backlog of work. He added by saying that because the Habitat Conservation Planning (HCP) effort was initiated in the COT's Department of Urban Planning and Design (UPD), that is where the HCP materials had previously been posted online. However, now that the COT has the OCSD, the HCP effort is no longer part of UPD. The OCSD web site is under construction, but there have been delays outside the control of OCSD. *[Action Item: Jamie will see if the TAC meeting minutes and agendas can be posted to the UPD site until materials can be posted to the OCSD site.]*

Regarding the minutes from the September 19, 2007 joint Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Town of Marana (hereinafter “Marana”) Technical Biology Team (TBT) meeting, Jamie reported that edits or comments were received from Ralph, Linwood, and Dennis. Before finalizing, the TAC briefly discussed some of the comments in the minutes, which were addressed and will be reflected in the finalized minutes. *[Action Items: Jamie clarify with Ralph and Leslie on whether the parcel adjacent to the Ironwood Forest National Monument, known as “Trust 205,” was changed to Priority Conservation Area from an earlier designation. Also, Jamie will distribute the hydrologic study completed at the Trico Road Bridge to the TAC.]*

With regard to the minutes from the 2-21-07 and 3-7-07 meetings, Jamie asked how the TAC wanted to proceed after reviewing them in terms of designating them either “draft” or “final.” Since only one TAC member wanted to finalize the minutes, the decision was made to review and edit the minutes like all other meeting minutes, but to designate them as “draft.” Rich mentioned that he wanted to know during which meeting it was discovered that there was no individual was in charge of coordinating burrowing owls (BUOW) conservation. He said that he would review the minutes Jamie e-mailed to him from around that time to determine which meeting that was. *[Action item: OCSD staff find out who has Wild at Heart’s BUOW relocation data and get this for the TAC. Also, ask Bob Fox from Wild at Heart if he would be willing to attend a TAC meeting.]*

## 2. Updates

### Conway and Garcia study on Glyphosate, buffelgrass, and burrowing owls

Dr. Courtney Conway, Professor at the University of Arizona, reported on the results of his study in Avra Valley entitled, “Glyphosate Applications to Control Buffelgrass in Pima County: Effects on Burrowing Owls,” which he co-authored with Victoria Garcia. Courtney said that the goal was to evaluate the results of buffelgrass control measures on BUOW. In a buffelgrass-infested area planned for glyphosate [active ingredient in RoundUp] spraying, Courtney’s team surveyed for nesting BUOW. After spraying, they monitored BUOW nesting productivity as well as BUOW persistence to burrows and BUOW mortality. These data were compared to demographic data on other BUOW throughout the Tucson Basin collected over a five to six year period. His group surveyed the study area prior to treatment and found only one occupied burrow within which a nesting pair was present. Thus, when the treatment was applied, there was only one nesting pair in the area, which greatly reduced their ability to measure treatment effects. He noted that the buffelgrass treatment did not occur as uniformly as planned. The original idea was that the area was first going to be mowed, then sprayed. He noted that weather and other issues caused delays, so Tucson Water decided to do a controlled burn of the area before spraying. He said that there were two fires, splitting the area into two halves. Both of the fires burned only about 50 to 65 percent of the area. So, the treatment involved a patchwork of burning or mowing, followed by spraying.

Courtney continued by saying that the two owls did not abandon the burrows and that they successfully reproduced. They detected no evidence of adult or juvenile mortality as well as no evidence of juvenile deformities. After the burning and spraying, other BUOW moved into this area to nest. Dennis asked about the timing of the treatment, to which Courtney said that it took

place over the summer. Courtney mentioned that since the sample size was so small, it would be helpful to have ongoing surveys to further determine impacts of spraying on BUOW. In response to a question about the acreage of the treatment area, Courtney thought it was between 10 to 40 acres but didn't know off the top of his head. *[Action Item: OCSD staff will coordinate with Courtney to determine the study area size and share the information with the TAC.]*

Trevor asked Ann several questions about buffelgrass treatments in Avra Valley. Ann said burning took place to remove thatch and allow better contact with glyphosate at green up. Also, there was interest in controlled burning of buffelgrass, and Avra Valley is one location where this can safely be conducted. She said that mowing occurred around the burrows prior to the burn. Courtney said that staff members from Saguaro National Park have been working for several years on buffelgrass control efforts. He mentioned the data they have, which may not be published data, suggest that neither mowing nor burning enhance the effectiveness of glyphosate application to buffelgrass. This is something he has been told informally. *[Action Item: OCSD contact Saguaro National Park staff to find documentation on whether mowing or burning enhance the effectiveness of glyphosate application on buffelgrass.]* Courtney said that it would be useful to continue studies on the impacts of these buffelgrass eradication strategies if there are no results showing what burning or mowing do to impact the effectiveness of glyphosate treatment.

Courtney said that transects were done before the buffelgrass treatment to get an idea of how much buffelgrass was present. Ann noted that Courtney's contract has ended and that no follow-up or repeat studies have been conducted to her knowledge. Trevor suggested that operations and maintenance for Pima County and the COT include monitoring as a task when treating buffelgrass. That way, HCP research funds are not used for this task. Ann reported that, from the regional buffelgrass meetings she has been attending, it has become clear that there is a dearth of funds for the enormous task of controlling buffelgrass. A strategic plan is currently being prepared, which includes research and monitoring among other tasks. Jamie asked if Tucson Water staff members conduct any monitoring as part of buffelgrass treatment. Ries said that Harold Maxwell, land manager for Tucson Water, would be very interested in this conversation though he said he did not know what monitoring, if any, is being done through his office.

Courtney said that the National Park Service is interested in doing a controlled burn in Avra Valley to study the effects of buffelgrass on fire intensity. So, their interest is not about control, but about safety. He said that surveys are needed in advance to select a location that has no BUOW present. Courtney was asked if there is any information regarding BUOW and fire in other parts of the state or country. Courtney responded that, through his work in Washington State, there is anecdotal information showing that BUOW did not abandon a fire-swept area.

Dennis asked if any follow-up with the nesting BUOW was done or planned. Courtney said "no" because the contract concluded but that, to his knowledge, the two BUOW were overwintering there. Dennis then asked how long it will take before we know that the treatments were successful and if there were any negative impacts to the BUOW. Ann said that, to her knowledge, she does not think Tucson Water has a structured study established at this time. Dennis said that Courtney's study was a snapshot view and so we need to think about the number of years of study that we need to determine if the treatments are or are not having the desired

effect. Dennis asked if someone has set up a plan to determine if the treatments should continue as is or be changed. He added that, depending on the answers to some of these questions, this will determine whether or not Courtney's work should be continued. He said that if these same types of treatments occur over the next few years, we may find some important information about how BUOW are impacted, such as if they have deformities. Dennis suggested that the TAC consider paying attention and funding over a longer period of time. Trevor said that he agrees and said it may be worth investigating fairly simple tools that Harold Maxwell of Tucson Water could use in the field to standardize his data collection, even if it consists of ocular data collection. Ann mentioned that Tucson Water has photo monitoring points established and mentioned a three-year plan of treatment and reseedling that was developed earlier as part of the HCP effort. *[Action Item: OCSD or Tucson Water staff contact Harold Maxwell to ask about any buffelgrass treatment plans or monitoring efforts in place or planned for the lands in Avra Valley.]* Ann said that one idea is to get more specific about the areas to be treated and to follow the plan that was developed by the HCP group. She noted that restoration is an important factor that the seeding study will help inform. She added that, within the COT, she does not know if any buffelgrass area has been totally controlled to date.

Trevor said that he was under the assumption that Travis Bean and the U.S. Geological Survey were taking the lead on the science behind what Tucson Water is doing to treat and monitor buffelgrass. He mentioned Travis's seed bank studies being paid for through the COT HCP grant. Ann responded that the purpose of the seed bank study is to determine if there is enough residual, airborne buffelgrass seed in that area to reseed the buffelgrass once it has been eradicated initially. She continued by saying that Travis has had to continue that study through this spring and that they are now in the process of counting the seeds. She said this is a different question than those regarding the treatment of glyphosate.

Ann mentioned that Travis has helped raise awareness of the buffelgrass threat among Tucson Basin land managers and a number of land managers and resource experts are attending monthly buffelgrass meetings. The buffelgrass strategic plan will be released on February 4, 2008. Also, there is a high-level field trip being conducted with business and political leaders in which they will be shown areas in the Catalina foothills where buffelgrass has taken over. She mentioned that there are two schools of thought. The first is to focus on controlling buffelgrass. The second is to make contingency plans for the fires that could result from increased buffelgrass infestations. Whether or not we are at that tipping point is still a question. She noted that March 1, 2008 is Buffelgrass Eradication Day.

There was a question about toxicity studies of glyphosate. According to Courtney, LD 50 studies have been done to investigate the specific amounts ingested that cause mortality. However, he is not aware of studies of impacts on embryonic development or of studies that investigated whether or not the chemical causes birds to leave an area. He added that, even though he is not an expert on glyphosate, he understands that the substance breaks down quickly in the environment and that it does not bioaccumulate. He added that glyphosate does not move down the food chain and that it does not cause death in lab animals. Trevor reported that Phil Rosen was not concerned about the impact of glyphosate application on desert anurans. Rich noted that the surfactant used with glyphosate might be a concern based on literature he read.

### Burrowing Owl Working Group meeting in December

Dennis reported that he drafted a list of questions about BUOW for Marana's HCP effort and that the BUOW Working Group met to answer those questions in December. *[Action Item: Dennis will share with OCSD staff the list of questions and answers on BUOW that was presented to Marana.]* Also, as part of that meeting, Sherry Ruther of Pima County had concerns about how guidelines for municipalities and protocols for developers would be compatible with Pima County's current guidelines and development standards. Dennis suggested contacting Sherry if more specifics are needed about this discussion.

### BUOW White Paper

Jamie reported that the BUOW Working Group white paper from June 2007 entitled, "Burrowing Owl Management Guidelines for Municipalities in Arizona" had not been formally discussed by the TAC. Dennis offered to walk the TAC through the document during the meeting, but suggested, instead, that TAC members read it at home, think of questions to send Dennis who will work with the BUOW Working Group to answer, and then discuss this subject at a later meeting. Trevor agreed. Dennis said that the document details specific actions and considerations about translocations, including the creation of Burrowing Owl Management Areas (BOMAs). Dennis said that these ongoing concerns come from not really knowing the answers because background research is not available. He continued by saying that the BUOW Working Group is pooling expertise and experience to come up with a workable way to deal with management issues. So, he said that it is an on-going process that is not likely to yield specific answers to all concerns in the short term. He said that the COT might need to create a plan and then respond to issues as they arise. In other words, adaptive management is key. Dennis said that there is no one expert at AGFD assigned to the BUOW, but that expert resources are available.

Trevor asked about the carrying capacity of BUOW release areas, and whether this has been determined. Dennis said at the meetings he has attended, the BUOW Working group has not dealt specifically with this topic. Dennis said that they did develop survey protocols on which there will be a training session in early March. Details of the upcoming training will be announced 30-days prior on the AGFD website.

### TAC membership

Jamie reported that Mima has removed herself from the TAC, with Marit replacing her as the USFWS representative.

### Memorandum from COT Council Member Steve Leal regarding the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (SDCP)

A memorandum from COT Council Member Steve Leal regarding Pima County's Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan (SDCP) was distributed. Jamie said that the COT is updating the General Plan this year, which will include lands outside the current COT boundary. Leslie will recommend that the General Plan include language describing Pima County's Conservation Land System (CLS), a component of the SDCP, and that the CLS and SDCP be acknowledged in annexations and rezonings for these lands outside the COT boundary.

Trevor noted that, for several years, the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, pushed the COT either to sign on to Pima County's SDCP or to adopt the CLS. After much discussion, it was concluded that the CLS does not provide enough conservation for lands within the COT because it was intended for a broader scale. He said, however, that the CLS guidelines for set asides (i.e. Important Riparian Areas require 95 percent, Biological Core requires 80 percent, and Multiple Use requires 66 and 2/3 percent) are useful and should be applied to the COT HCPs.

#### Pima County Science Technical Advisory Team (STAT) Monitoring Subcommittee

Jamie reported that the first meeting was held in November, with the next meeting scheduled for March. He said that this introductory meeting involved Brian Powell sharing information similar to what he shared with the TAC at the September 19, 2007 meeting. This included reviewing what the SDCP is, discussing the Phase I activities of the monitoring program such as holding the expert workshops, and the goals for Phase 2, which will occur in 2008. During Phase 2, the Subcommittee will work with staff on choosing a suite of indicators for monitoring. The intent is to report to the Board of Supervisors in December on a monitoring plan and the estimated costs [*Action Item: Jamie will distribute meeting minutes to the TAC from the STAT Monitoring Subcommittee meeting.*]

Trevor expressed concern that Pima County's program may not include monitoring the rarest species since they are seeking inexpensive ways to monitor ecosystems broadly, such as via remote sensing. Dennis responded by saying that he thought that rare species would be monitored while also looking at broad ecological predictors. Trevor said it has not yet decided, but that cost would be a factor in determining how detailed and species-specific the monitoring will be.

### **3. Discussion**

#### A. Segment 2: Schedule and remaining tasks

Jamie distributed a schedule of HCP tasks, deliverables, and grant segment numbers. The major remaining deliverables for Segment 2 include a revised draft of the Southlands HCP due in mid-February and the revised draft of the Avra Valley HCP due in late-May. These grant deliverables will be available for TAC review once they are submitted to AGFD. Ann added that these drafts may not necessarily be completed and that there may still be blank chapters, especially with the Southlands, as much still needs to be discussed. Jamie reported that OSCD and Tucson Water staff will meet next week to discuss the Avra Valley HCP. This will allow Tucson Water administrators not directly involved in the HCP effort to keep informed of what conservation measures have been discussed thus far.

Trevor asked about the Environmental Consultants Request for Proposal. Ann responded that the deadline will be Friday, January 18. She said that the selection of consultants will then lead to development of specific scopes of work on an as-needed basis.

#### B. Segment 3: Review schedule and discuss survey priorities

Referring to the table of HCP deliverables, Jamie said that publishing of the Notice of Intent to draft an Environmental Impact Statement and hosting the Scoping Meeting for the Avra Valley

HCP are planned to take place during the summer and fall of 2008. On page two of the handout, additional activities as part of National Environmental Policy Act compliance for the HCP were listed as what would likely occur under Segment 4. Jamie noted that the abbreviation “GS/SCR” referred to the “Greater Southlands/Santa Cruz River” as was stated in the Intergovernmental Agreements between AGFD and the COT.

With regard to the “summary of regional species discussions” deliverable, Jamie asked the TAC which species should be part of these discussions. Trevor suggested that all species that the COT is dealing with are worthy of regional discussions. He noted that the same conversations that the TAC is having about the BUOW are occurring in Marana’s Technical Biology Team (TBT) meetings. Dennis noted the lesser long-nosed bat (LLNB) work has crossed jurisdictions. Trevor mentioned the importance of coordinated monitoring and management across jurisdictions involved in Habitat Conservation Plans. Rich asked which jurisdiction would be in charge to which Trevor responded that a nonprofit organization could handle the data and funds or a University of Arizona office could take the lead.

Trevor said that the Tucson Basin Manager’s Group might be a good place to start regional species conversations as that group also includes the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Natural Resource Conservation Service, and others. Marit agreed and said that the next meeting will take place on March 20. Rich said that the joint meeting between Marana’s TBT and the COT TAC did not materialize as a joint way to address species that have interjurisdictional implications. Rich said that now is a good time to figure out which species need to be discussed between all jurisdictions. He recommended that all of the species that overlap need to be discussed among all jurisdictions. Rich said that since Marana and Tucson are the jurisdictions seeking permits, these meetings should happen between staff members of jurisdictions and basin wide managers, not TAC/TBT members. *[Action Item: OCSD staff will discuss interjurisdictional species planning and how that can be accomplished.]*

Jamie reported on a handout of surveys and studies that have taken place as part of the HCP process and the status of each. He noted that there is about \$26,000 remaining in the Segment 2 grant that could be used for surveys or studies. The IGA for Segment 2 does not officially conclude until June 2009, with the surveys listed as “ongoing”. For the Segment 3 grant, he noted that about \$25,000 will be available for surveys.

In terms of survey recommendations, Trevor noted that, at the Marana HCP meeting, the Technical Biology Team discussed Tucson shovel-nosed snake (TSS) surveys with Phil Rosen. He said that Phil has a \$2,000 contract with Marana to study the TSS this spring and summer season, but that he needs more money. According to Trevor, Phil has observed TSS in the Picacho area, but not in the area just west of Marana. The goal of the study is to find the area between Picacho and Marana where TSS occur to determine its current range. Trevor asked if the COT would cooperate in this study by contributing funding. Trevor also said that funding buffelgrass studies should be a priority. He added that studying high-density areas of PPC in Southlands as potential mitigation banks or “no touch” areas is also something to consider.

Rich asked about LLNB studies. Dennis said he thinks there are remaining 2007 LLNB study funds to be used in 2008. *[Action Item: Dennis will check with Mike Ingraldi about the amount*

*of funding set aside from the COT grants by AGFD for LLNB research.] Rich asked if any new LLNB roosting locations were observed in the north and west areas of eastern Pima County. Dennis said that no new roosts were found as part of the study. He added that AGFD staff members do not know the exact locations of roosts used by the tracked LLNB and so they speculate that the tracked LLNB are going to the known roosts. Dennis said that the AGFD believes that there are roosts that have not yet been discovered because there are areas in the mountains that are difficult to access and require technical climbing skills.*

C. Brief update on Pima pineapple cactus (Note: This item was discussed earlier in the meeting at the prompting of TAC members)

Jamie reported that there was an internal conversation between COT staff and USFWS staff specific to the Southlands HCP, with PPC conservation as a specific topic. Off-site mitigation was discussed and the USFWS staff is looking into this alternative, with the intent to report to the TAC later this spring. Jamie said that no decisions have been made about on-site or off-site mitigation. Trevor requested that if PPC conservation is to be discussed in detail at a future meeting, that Mima Falk of USFWS be invited to attend. He also said that he wants to ensure that on-site mitigation be considered as well as the off-site mitigation banking. Trevor asked if the Westland Resources staff members had any information they wanted to share about the PPC since three were in attendance at the meeting.

Mike from Westland Resources referred to the meeting summary from the October 2007 TAC meeting in which PPC propagation was discussed. Given Westland Resources' experience with the subject, he said that they wanted to share what they have learned regarding PPC propagation and transplanting. He and Bob reported that because Pima County's NPPO requires preservation in place or replacement and that PPC are not commercially available, they were able to get a permit from the Arizona Department of Agriculture and Horticulture to collect PPC seed from a client's property. They reported that, three years ago, they collected fruits and were able to raise 15 viable plants for mitigation purposes, with 20 additional plants left over. Mike mentioned that he knows this approach does not address habitat conservation but that he wanted the TAC to know that the method is available. Trevor asked about long-term transplant success. Mike said that they do not know, but they are monitoring that. Trevor asked if the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service accepted this. Mike said that the purpose was to comply with Pima County's NPPO as mitigation.

Dennis asked if anything special was done to germinate the PPC seeds. Bob reported that seeds germinated readily at about 80 degrees. He said that germination rates were greater than 90 percent. Bob passed around young PPC that had been planted in plastic pots with fertilized soil and that were watered once a week. He suggested that soils used contain some clay in them to retain moisture. Dennis asked about survival rates if removed from a greenhouse. If herbivores are present, Bob said that it is a good idea to use hardware cloth cones to protect the PPC. He said that they look at the micro sites where the PPC are found naturally and transplant seedlings in a similar environment (e.g. near shrubs on certain soils).

In term of transplanting adults, Bob said that for the second Tohono O'odham casino, they transplanted about 35 plants to sites similar from where they came within one hour of removal. When transplanting the adults, the key was to water weekly for half-a-year to get them



reestablished. In the case of the transplanted PPC from the casino project, all survived transplant and flowered and fruited two years later. Bob said that no hormones were used on the roots, nor were roots dusted with sulphur (to deter bacterial and fungal growth). Bob said that it is a good idea to leave as much original soil on the roots as possible. He said that PPC have a large taproot that extends about six inches downward, plus lateral roots that extend about a meter from a mature plant. He said that one does not need to get all lateral roots when transplanting, but noted that it is important to correctly position the roots close to the soil surface. He recommended against using excessive fertilizer and instead, recommended using time-release fertilizer containing iron.

Dennis commented that the information was very interesting, saying that people had often heard that propagation and transplanting were difficult. Trevor concurred and said that he thinks that that perception may have come from the Madera Highlands project. In that case, PPC were left in a greenhouse for a year and were transplanted in the wrong locations. Trevor said that as long as plants can be closely monitored and developers are willing to follow the protocol, this should be acceptable as mitigation for an HCP. Dennis asked if there could be a proposal to conduct an experiment in the Southlands to translocate PPC in the near future as a preliminary step in trying to decide how to manage the species. He wondered if this is something that the USFWS would find acceptable. Amanda noted that there is a 10-year study planned on PPC propagation and transplanting through Pima County's Swan Southlands rezoning process. Trevor asked if the USFWS was giving Pima County credit for this to which Amanda replied that it was being done for the County's rezoning process. She mentioned that there is no federal nexus on the project and so no USFWS consultation is necessary. Trevor wondered if the A-Hook project would be a good project site. Trevor thought that the Swan Southlands study is something the TAC should keep informed of since the COT's HCP Southlands completely surround Pima County's Swan Southlands.

Jamie reiterated that no decisions had been made about on-site or off-site mitigation. Dennis noted that the Southlands will be impacted dramatically and that if what the TAC heard from Westland Resources staff has promise for application in the field, research should be done soon. Trevor noted that pollination distance is a factor in PPC genetic interchange and wondered whether the work described by Westland Resources staff could be used to minimize distance between plants throughout the Southlands, especially if habitat protection would need to be off-site.

Bob noted that their work is not the first of its kind and that there are other reports indicating the ease in which PPC can be propagated. Guy noted that Trisha Roller wrote a master's thesis at the University of Arizona about PPC, including the topic of PPC propagation. Bob said that he planted 100 seeds six years ago and they are now about 12 mm in height, with an extensive taproot. He noted that 51 of the 100 seeds germinated and established. These were protected from rodents inside nailed down cages without water or fertilizer. After 6 years in the wild, the plants are extremely small compared with the nursery grown seedlings. Since these six-year-old PPC were only the size of a pencil eraser top, they may easily go undetected. Thus, one might need to crawl on hands and knees to detect them in the wild. Bob thinks that PPC may require 15 to 20 years to go from seed to first flowering due to the extremely slow growth. He noted that there are patches of plants that have different life spans as a group (5 years for example) and

other patches that have PPC with very long life spans (30 to 50 years or more). So, he said that there are varied landscapes within eastern Pima County that may support PPC, but with different population characteristics.

Mike said that stakeholders are concerned about PPC mitigation in the HCP process. Ann said that stakeholders would be involved through the Resource Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) process whereas the TAC focuses on science. Trevor concurred with Ann. Jamie noted that at the November 2007 TAC meeting, USFWS staff requested that TAC members read the USFWS 5-year review of PPC prior to an in-depth discussion at a future meeting.

#### D. Westcor plan and the Southlands HCP

David Jacobs from the Arizona Attorney General's office reported that on January 11, 2008 an urban planning permit was entered between the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) and Westcor to master plan the State Trust Land within the area indicated by the map Jamie distributed. He mentioned that the map, which was created by the Arizona Daily Star, might not be 100 percent accurate. David continued by saying that the agreement was arranged in three phases. Phase 1 will involve reviewing any existing planning documentation, opportunities mapping, and preparing initial ideas about where disposessions and initial sales should be. When these sales will take place has not been decided. Follow-up planning will be required before any development can take place, but also before the purchaser has full title to the land. The first phase is expected to take about ten months. The plans are intended to be integrated into the COT's planning, such as the Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP). He said that the COT is also working on their planned community development zoning process, which is supposedly another way to help implement this.

Jamie reported that approximately 4,000 acres of Westcor's planning area falls within the Southlands HCP planning area. He said that Leslie recommends that, for the next TAC meeting, Westcor staff be invited to discuss the planning area and other issues. Jamie relayed Leslie's current thinking that this could be a "win-win" situation for both Westcor and the COT's HCP planning. Westcor's detailed, on-the-ground work on these 4,000 acres will inform the HCP effort and, in-turn, what the TAC has done and will hopefully inform Westcor's process.

Trevor asked David if the Southlands Westcor process would be similar to Westcor's Oro Valley process. David said that these are different as what happened in Oro Valley was a state conceptual plan (i.e. a big, bubble map with pictures) and that, for the area around the Southlands, it will be a state conceptual plan as well as a community master plan. The Oro Valley process was more specific about what will happen. David said that the ASLD Commissioner needs to approve the outcome and that Westcor is, essentially, the consultant. The idea is to get ASLD staff as well as jurisdictional stakeholders involved throughout the process so that, once it is complete, it will not be the first time staff outside of Westcor will have seen the components.

Rich said that he would like to see the guidance that consultants received from ASLD because he wants to know what ASLD's priorities are, such as maximizing revenue or conserving biologically important lands. *[Action Item: OCSLD request ASLD guidance to Westcor on 12,000 acre master planning effort.]* David said the guidance is a list of what to think about and

consider, not just a consideration of potential revenue. He said they will be looking at habitat and will walk the riparian areas, for example. He said that Westcor will also look at the studies that have taken place in the area. As part of the Scope of Work, there will be discussions with COT officials to address concerns, including environmental ones. Trevor asked how the HAMP would fit into this. David said that he understands that the HAMP is part of the COT's General Plan. He added that the HAMP has principles and a map. The principles are a pretty strong statement of what the COT would like to see and the map is a best estimate given the knowledge of what is out there. He continued by saying that he thinks the principles are being reviewed, but that they are basically a tool for the Westcor process. Trevor said his questions were borne out of the concern that all the work that was put into the HAMP would be dismissed and replaced by this new process. David said that conversations will take place with the COT and that it does not do the ASLD any good to end the project with a fight between the entities.

Rich said that any roadway networks are important from a wildlife perspective. Trevor said that the roadways will affect the riparian areas and that riparian protection needs to be considered. Questions about the specific overlap with the HCP study area will be answered at the next meeting, when Westcor staff members attend. *[Action Item: Jamie will contact David Jacobs about getting the GIS shapefile for the Westcor master-planning boundary.]*

#### **4. Topics at upcoming meetings/schedule dates for upcoming meetings**

##### Upcoming meeting topics

Rich mentioned a conversation he had with Dennis Kubly of the Bureau of Reclamation (Las Vegas office). For the agency, he is now the point person for adaptive management. Rich said that, for the last ten years, Mr. Kubly has been focused on the Glen Canyon Dam and that the Bureau of Reclamation is changing river management through this adaptive management approach. Rich said that a presentation on this subject from Mr. Kubly might benefit the TAC. Other TAC members agreed and so Rich will coordinate with Leslie and Mr. Kubly on the feasibility and timing of this.

##### Schedule dates for upcoming meetings

The following dates were proposed for future TAC meetings: Feb 20, March 5, March 19, April 16, May 21, and June 18. The March 5 date is an alternate for the March 19 meeting should an in-depth PPC discussion be planned for that month. All meetings will take place from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office.

#### **5. Call to the audience**

There were no comments from members of the audience.

#### **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

---

Summary of Action Items:

- Jamie will see if the TAC meeting summaries and agendas can be posted to the UPD site until materials can be posted to the OCSD site;
- Jamie clarify with Ralph and Leslie on whether the parcel adjacent to the Ironwood Forest National Monument, known as “Trust 205,” was changed to Priority Conservation Area from an earlier designation;
- Jamie will distribute the hydrologic study completed at the Trico Road Bridge to the TAC;
- OCSD staff will find out who has Wild at Heart’s BUOW relocation data and get this for the TAC;
- OCSD staff ask Bob Fox from Wild at Heart if he would be willing to attend a TAC meeting;
- OCSD staff will coordinate with Courtney Conway to determine the study area size and share the information with the TAC;
- OCSD contact Saguaro National Park staff to find documentation on whether mowing or burning enhances the effectiveness of glyphosate application on buffelgrass;
- OCSD or Tucson Water staff contact Harold Maxwell to ask about any buffelgrass treatment plans or monitoring efforts in place or planned for the lands in Avra Valley;
- Dennis will share with OCSD staff the list of questions and answers on BUOW that was presented to Marana;
- Jamie will distribute meeting minutes to the TAC from the STAT Monitoring Subcommittee meeting;
- OCSD staff will discuss interjurisdictional species planning and how that can be accomplished;
- Dennis will check with Mike Ingraldi about the amount of funding set aside from the COT grants by AGFD for LLNB research;
- OCSD request ASLD guidance to Westcor on 12,000-acre master planning effort, and;
- Jamie will contact David Jacobs about getting the GIS shapefile for the Westcor master-planning boundary.